

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Adam Wayne Spradley,)	Civil Action No.: 5:19-214-BHH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Andrew M. Saul,)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Adam Wayne Spradley’s (“Plaintiff”) pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), wherein Plaintiff seeks judicial review of the Commissioner of Social Security’s final decision, which denied Plaintiff’s claim for disability insurance benefits. The record includes the report and recommendation (“Report”) of a United States Magistrate Judge, which was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C. In the Report, which was filed on March 31, 2020, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court affirm the Commissioner’s final decision denying benefits. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole

or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the Court hereby adopts and specifically incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 36). Therefore, for the reasons set forth in the Report, it is **ORDERED** that the Commissioner’s decision denying benefits is affirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

April 21, 2020
Charleston, South Carolina